

## Visit to Congress

May 11, 2005

- A. Purpose of our visit.
- B. Who went.
- C. Who we visited and talked to.
- D. How we prepared.
- E. Structure of the visits.
- F. What we left behind.
- G. Our impressions from the visits.



A. Purpose of our visit:

1. Request 3.2% increase for DOE Office of Science in 2006
2. Request addition of \$18 million for RHIC operations

B. Who went:

Jim Cochran	ISU HEP
John Hill	ISU NP
John Lajoie	ISU NP
Jianwei Qiu	ISU NP

C. Who we visited:

Leonard Boswell	(D)	House
Tom Latham	(R)	House
Tom Harkin	(D)	Senate
Charles Grassley	(R)	Senate

#### D. How we prepared.

1. Got briefing from APS staff at noon lunch at APS office.
2. Got individualized materials from APS to leave with representatives.
3. I prepared two page document for each representative.
4. After briefings and discussions on May 10 revised documents.

#### E. Structure of the visits.

1. Introductions and who we represent.
2. Thanks for support of several kinds.
3. Core message (research secures future).
4. Why science needs more support.
  
5. Importance to Iowa.
6. Our RHIC research program.
7. Our problem of proposed RHIC funding.
8. Our request:
  - a) Increase of 3.2% for DOE Office of Science budget.
  - b) Restoration of \$18 million for RHIC operations.

#### F. What we left behind.

1. Materials from APS on why DOE and NSF needs more support.
2. Document from BNL on latest RHIC progress and needs.
3. Short powerpoint on RHIC basics.

**Tenth Annual  
Science-Engineering-Technology  
Congressional Visits Day  
May 10-11, 2005**

***Core Message***

**Federally funded research secures the nation's future.**

**Schedule**

**Participant Briefing Packet (Background Material)**

**Smithsonian Maps**

**Materials for Use During Capitol Hill Visits:**

**Federally Funded Research Secures the Nation's Future (main CVD flyer)**

**Federally Funded Research Enhances our Quality of Life**

**Federally Funded Research Strengthens our Security**

**State Briefing Sheets**

#### D. How we prepared.

1. Got briefing from APS staff at noon lunch at APS office.
2. Got individualized materials from APS to leave with representatives.
3. I prepared two page document for each representative.
4. After briefings and discussions on May 10 revised documents.

#### E. Structure of the visits.

1. Introductions and who we represent.
2. Thanks for support of several kinds.
3. Core message (research secures future).
4. Why science needs more support.
  
5. Importance to Iowa.
6. Our RHIC research program.
7. Our problem of proposed RHIC funding.
8. Our request:
  - a) Increase of 3.2% for DOE Office of Science budget.
  - b) Restoration of \$18 million for RHIC operations.

#### F. What we left behind.

1. Materials from APS on why DOE and NSF needs more support.
2. Document from BNL on latest RHIC progress and needs.
3. Short powerpoint on RHIC basics.

G. Our impressions from the visits.

1. All persons agreed more support for research vital to U.S.
2. Several agreed physical sciences needs to catch up with NIH.
3. No one questioned the value of our research at RHIC.
4. Connection of RHIC involvement to ISU status accepted.
  
5. All representatives accept Latham have signed letters to appropriation committees requesting more \$\$ for DOE and NSF.
6. Latham is member of House Energy and Water Appropriations Committee and met with us personally along with key staffer.
7. This committee appropriates DOE Office of Science funding.
8. He said he would see if he could help on RHIC funding item during the “mark up” which was yesterday.
  
9. I have not heard how that went.